

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 16-18 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 16 and 17 have been amended.

Claim 18 is newly entered.

No new matter is entered as a result of the amendments.

The claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth herein. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification is objected to due to the language of the Abstract.

The Abstract has been amended thereby rendering the objection moot.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 6 and 8-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being improper form.

Claims 3, 6, 10 and 11 have been amended thereby rendering the objections directed thereto moot.

Claims 8, 9 and 12-14 are cancelled thereby rendering the objections directed thereto moot.

Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 12, 14 and 17 are objected to due to informalities.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 10 and 17 have been amended thereby rendering the objection moot.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 12 and 14 are cancelled thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,154,561).

Lee is cited as disclosing an automated all-weather cargo transfer system. Applicants agree.

Lee is cited as disclosing at least one unbonded cable with reference to Fig. 3a. Applicants respectfully disagree with this reading of Lee. Element 20 is not a cable but a cylindrical metal support beam as further set forth with reference to Fig. 4. The only cables described in Lee are those utilized to secure the barges to the sea bed. These can not be considered to meet the limitation of having one end secured to the main structure and the opposite end secured to a different location on the main structure. Due to the failure of Lee to

recite, at least, the unbonded cable the rejection of claim 1, and claims dependent thereon, is improper.

In addition to the above mentioned deficiency Lee fails to mention an actuator resting permanently between the main structure and the unbonded cable as recited in claim 1. Due to the failure of Lee to recite this claim limitation the rejection of claim 1, and claims dependent thereon, is improper.

Lee fails to recite an actuator which extends or retracts in order to increase or decrease the tension of the unbonded cable as set forth in claim 1 and claims dependent thereon by dependence. Lee does teach actuators, however, they regulate the structures position but do not improve strength or reduce deformations and unwanted stress. Due to the failure of Lee to recite this claim limitation the rejection of claim 1, and claims dependent thereon, is improper.

The rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee is improper due to the failure of Lee to recite critical elements of the claimed invention. Alternatively, the rejection is rendered moot by amendment. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that a notice of allowance be issued.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 16-18 are pending in the present application. All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Client No.; 46591

December 6, 2007